

QUESTIONS POSED AT 1ST PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION / CAG MEETING

11 APRIL 2012

Pre-Session Topics of Concern / Questions:

Alternative technologies – What was considered in the FS?

Birds that feed on fish – Were the risks posed to these birds considered in the risk assessment? What did it show?

Current state at Portland Harbor – Are there still polluters out there?

EPA internal and external expert reviews – How will the outcomes of these reviews be considered in the LWG-produced FS?

USACOE – What has been the Corps involvement in the Superfund process?

Questions Posed During Session:

What guidance(s) did EPA provide to the LWG for their use in developing the FS?

What process was followed to select and approve the early actions work completed to date?

What levels of COIs and/or criteria were used to determine the need for early actions work completed to date?

What is the definition of imminent and substantial endangerment and is guidance available?

How many total COIs have been looked at over the entire site?

Were PCBS considered as endocrine disrupters for river mammals (ie., otters, etc.)?

Do PCBs bioaccumulate in animals?

How did EPA derive the fish consumption numbers used in the human-health risk assessment?

Note: Statement made that these numbers are unrealistic.

What about the risks to current workers exposed to the environment at the Portland Harbor?

Note: Statement made that worker's comp claims have occurred and continue to occur for Harbor-area employees.

Who is polluting the river now?

What is meant by background and how do you define background?

On the LWG “RALs slide”, why do some COCs have “NA” instead of a numerical value?

For lower PCBs RAL values, will the area needing cleanup expand in size verse the areas for cleanup of higher RALs values?

If you clean up PCBs to some low RAL, does that mean that you will get rid of the DDx and other COCs without numerical RALs (ie., “NA” in the RALs table)?

What are CADs and CDFs?

On the LWG “Alternatives slide”, what are the units for the in-situ treatment areas?

Statement made that how and where you measure MNR are key factors for consideration in determining the actual effectiveness of MNR.

For how long would a CDF need to be monitored?

How would caps be monitored for effectiveness?

How can visual monitoring of a cap provide any indication of what is happening with the COCs?

Statement made that there is a possibility to obtain variances in the in-water work window to increase the working season for remedial action implementation.

Statement made that there are techniques available to reduce the suspension of solids in the dredging process.

Does the FS determine the party responsible for the actual remedial action implementation costs?

What was the timescale taken into account in the determination of longterm effectiveness?

How were monitoring costs calculated for the various alternatives?

Do the cost estimates include any monies for financial assurance in the event that an implemented remedial action fails?

How were the navigational channel area requirements (ie., depth) taken into account in the FS alternatives development?

Does the FS include an evaluation of innovative technologies?

Session was formally ended at 8:15 pm but unrecorded questioning on the FS to the LWG reps continued by CAG members.